Invited Review Article, Accepted for Publication in Annalen der Physik
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1407.7544v1 [astro-ph.CO] 28 Jul 2014

RE-EXAMINING ASTROPHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS ON THE DARK MATTER MODEL

Alyson M. Brooks[1]

Invited Review Article, Accepted for Publication in Annalen der Physik

ABSTRACT

Recent high-resolution simulations that include Cold Dark Matter (CDM) and baryons have shown that baryonic physics can dramatically alter the dark matter structure of galaxies. These results modify our predictions for observed galaxy evolution and structure. Given these updated expectations, it is timely to re-examine observational constraints on the dark matter model. A few observations exist that may indirectly trace dark matter, and may help confirm or deny possible dark matter models. Warm Dark Matter (WDM) and Self-Interacting Dark Matter (SIDM) are currently the favorite alternative models to CDM. Constraints on the WDM particle mass require it to be so heavy that WDM is nearly indistinguishable from CDM. The best observational test of SIDM is likely to be in the dark matter distribution of faint dwarf galaxies, but there is a lack of theoretical predictions for galaxy structure in SIDM that account for the role of baryons.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is six times more mass in dark matter than baryonic matter [2] in our Universe (Hinshaw et al. 2013; Planck Collaboration et al. 2013). For decades it has been assumed that, because dark matter is so much more common than baryons, dark matter dominates the gravity in the Universe, and that wherever the dark matter is, baryons must follow. This assumption led galaxy theorists to make predictions for the formation of galaxies using dark matter only, neglecting baryonic physics, despite the fact that galaxies like our own Milky Way are baryon-dominated within their inner ∼10kpc. In doing so, a number of discrepancies between galaxy formation theory and observations were identified, particularly on "small scales," i.e., in small galaxies and in the central regions of galaxies (Primack 2012). To address these problems, alternative models to the standard Cold Dark Matter (CDM) have been explored. Recent interest has surged in Warm Dark Matter (WDM) and Self-Interacting Dark Matter (SIDM) models as the favorite alternatives to CDM amongst galaxy theorists.

However, there has also been a recent reconsideration of the importance of baryonic physics in solving CDM's small scale problems. Observationally, it is clear that energy feedback from stars and black holes operates to alter the evolution of galaxies. For example, the existence of gas outflows ("winds") from galaxies seems to be ubiquitous at high redshift (Veilleux et al. 2005). Energetic feedback from stars (in the form of radiation pressure from young, massive stars, momentum injection by the winds of the same stars, and supernovae) has long been included in galaxy simulations, but only recently have simulations achieved sufficiently high resolution to deposit this feedback in localized regions. Localized feedback dramatically impacts the evolution of the galaxy (Governato et al. 2010; Guedes et al. 2011; Christensen et al. 2012; Agertz et al. 2013; Aumer et al. 2013; Hopkins et al. 2013), and drives the ubiquitous winds that we observe.

The processes that drive galaxy winds also have a dramatic impact on the dark matter structure of galaxies. Feedback from stars can push the dark matter out of the central ∼kpc by generating a repeated fluctuation in the potential wells of galaxies (Navarro et al. 1996; Read & Gilmore 2005; de Souza et al. 2011; Pontzen & Governato 2012; Teyssier et al. 2013; Di Cintio et al. 2014). This result reconciles the dark matter density profile predicted in CDM that is steeply rising toward the center ("cuspy," Navarro et al. 1997; Springel et al. 2008; Navarro et al. 2010) with observations which instead prefer a shallower density slope or even a constant dark matter density "core" (van den Bosch et al. 2000; de Blok et al. 2001; de Blok & Bosma 2002; Simon et al. 2003; Swaters et al. 2003; Weldrake et al. 2003; Kuzio de Naray et al. 2006; Gentile et al. 2007; Spano et al. 2008; Trachternach et al. 2008; de Blok et al. 2008; Oh et al. 2011). Hence, one of the seemingly intractable problems plaguing CDM theory is now thought to be potentially solved by a careful consideration of the impact of baryonic physics (Pontzen & Governato 2014).

Galaxy winds also solve another problem within CDM galaxy formation theory: the existence of bulgeless disk galaxies. Galaxies are thought to obtain their angular momentum through large-scale tidal torques (Peebles 1969; White 1984; Barnes & Efstathiou 1987; Quinn & Binney 1992). Gas and dark matter start with the same angular momentum distribution (van den Bosch et al. 2002), with a tail of low angular momentum material that is expected to settle at the center of galaxies. Low angular momentum gas should go on to form stars, forming large bulges, at odds with observed small or non-existent stellar bulges (van den Bosch et al. 2001; Dutton 2009). Galaxy winds naturally arise from the region where most star formation is occurring, in dense galaxy centers where low angular momentum gas resides. Hence, winds naturally drive low angular momentum material from galaxies (Brook et al. 2011), and

[1] Department of Physics & Astronomy, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 136 Frelinghuysen Rd, Piscataway, NJ 08854; abrooks@physics.rutgers.edu

[2] Throughout this review we adopt the common convention of astronomers to refer to all standard model particles, including leptons, as baryons.

can create bulgeless disk galaxies (Governato et al. 2010; Teyssier et al. 2013), solving another of CDM's small scale problems.

One of the oldest problems and one of the newest problems facing CDM galaxy formation theory both relate to the satellites that orbit around our Milky Way galaxy. First, simulations predict that there should be many more satellites than we observe (Moore et al. 1999; Klypin et al. 1999). Many of these satellites are expected to be "dark," unable to have formed stars due to photoevaporation of their gas when the Universe was re-ionized (Quinn et al. 1996; Thoul & Weinberg 1996; Barkana & Loeb 1999; Gnedin 2000; Okamoto et al. 2008), though this process alone may not be enough to bring the predicted number of massive, luminous satellites into agreement with observations (Brooks et al. 2013). Furthermore, even if we could get the number of satellites correct, there exists a population of satellites in simulations run without baryons that are much more dense than we observe (Boylan-Kolchin et al. 2011, 2012; Tollerud et al. 2012; Collins et al. 2014). This latter problem is also known as the "Too Big to Fail" problem because the simulated satellites are too massive to have failed to form stars, yet we do not observe them. Again, recent high resolution simulations have shown that baryonic effects may reconcile both of these predictions with observations (Zolotov et al. 2012; Di Cintio et al. 2013; Arraki et al. 2014). The primary physics at work is the fact that gas, unlike dark matter, can cool. In a simulation with baryons, this cooled component adds more mass to the center of the parent halo, creating stronger tidal forces that strip mass from the satellite galaxies (Peñarrubia et al. 2010). This enhanced tidal stripping reduces the mass of the satellites, bringing the kinematic predictions in line with the observational data (Brooks & Zolotov 2014). The presence of the disk in a baryonic simulation (which doesn't exist in a dark matter-only run because dark matter cannot dissipate) will also fully destroy roughly 1/3 of the most massive satellites, reducing the number of luminous, surviving satellites so that it is consistent with observations (Brooks et al. 2013; Brooks & Zolotov 2014).

The lesson we have learned from these studies is that baryons have the potential to alter our expectations for the structure of dark matter halos that form within CDM. While CDM does an excellent job of describing the large scale structure of the Universe (Hlozek et al. 2012), we can no longer neglect the influence of baryons when considering small scales. It is important to note that, of the problems listed above, the creation of bulgeless galaxies cannot be solved by any correction to the dark matter model. Only baryonic feedback is able to explain the loss of low angular momentum baryons from galaxies.

The fact that galaxy winds offer a single, unified solution to the existence of both bulgeless disks and dark matter cores is tantalizing evidence that these two problems are intimately tied together. Despite this, modifications to the dark matter model are still being pursued as another possible explanation for the existence of dark matter cores. Given the fact that baryonic physics cannot be neglected (and is in fact essential to solve at least one problem in CDM galaxy formation theory), the challenge for theorists is to first understand the role of baryons within any viable dark matter model.

Thus, it is becoming clear that using dark matter-only simulations leads to biased predictions for the distribution of dark matter in galaxies. The recent successes in modeling the baryonic component of galaxies have allowed theorists, *for the first time*, to realistically model dwarf galaxies (Governato et al. 2010, 2012; Shen et al. 2013; Trujillo-Gomez et al. 2013; Brooks & Zolotov 2014). Hence, simulators are finally in a position to be able to make predictions for observations that include the effect of baryons on galaxy evolution.

Our advances in understanding baryonic physics require that we re-evaluate current observational data with a new perspective. If baryons alter the evolution of dark matter halos, what are the real limits of the currently favored models? The goal of this review is to cast a critical eye on the observations in light of our favored models. What are the successes and failures of the models? What are potential paths forward to break degeneracies and to rule out models?

In what follows, I will assume that 100% of the dark matter follows a given model. I do not discuss the possibility of mixed models, (e.g., dark matter as a mix of both CDM and WDM, or WDM with self-interactions, or that some fraction of the dark matter is dissipative). There are currently a few intriguing signals that may be interpreted as an indirect detection of dark matter. These results will be reviewed in Section 2, but much of the power of observations lies in the ability to constrain our favored models. I will discuss the two popular models already mentioned, WDM and SIDM in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. The current observational constraints are already hinting that WDM cannot be warm enough to substantially differentiate it from CDM. SIDM offers a more tantalizing path forward, and I will highlight future theoretical and observational probes to test SIDM models.

2. INDIRECT DETECTION

Before discussing the properties of galaxies that constrain the dark matter model, I first discuss the evidence for a more straightforward astrophysical signal. Two possible paths may lead to detectable standard model particles indicative of the presence of dark matter. The first path is annihilation of dark matter, and the second is decay of a dark matter particle. Annihilation of dark matter in the Universe today is an expected signal of a favored candidate for a CDM particle: the Weakly Interacting Massive Particle (WIMP). In the WIMP model, dark matter particles are a thermal relic that "froze out" of equilibrium in the early Universe. Freeze-out occurs when the rate of annihilation between dark matter particles is outpaced by the Hubble expansion (Gondolo & Gelmini 1991; Kolb & Turner 1994). After freeze-out, annihilation does not significantly decrease the WIMP number density, but will continue at low rates in the Universe today. Annihilation is particularly likely to happen in the densest regions of the Universe, i.e., in galaxies, and particularly in high density galaxy centers.

Despite its popularity in the theory community, it is by no means certain that dark matter is a WIMP-like thermal relic (Feng & Kumar 2008). For example, if there is a primordial excess of WIMP particles over

their anti-particle pairs (as there seems to have been with baryons to anti-baryons), the WIMPs and anti-WIMPs may continue to annihilate until nearly all the anti-particles are eliminated.[3] The particle excess that is left over is the relic dark matter density in the Universe today. This option has become known as "asymmetric dark matter" (Nussinov 1985; Barr et al. 1990; Kaplan 1992; Kribs et al. 2010; Buckley & Randall 2011). As there is no particle to annihilate against today, indirect detection from annihilation is not expected in such models. However, a second type of indirect signal is possible if the dark matter particles instead decay. The lifetime of such decay must be very long ($\gtrsim 10^{26}$ seconds Ibarra et al. 2013), but such models can be constructed. Decaying dark matter has even been suggested as a solution to CDM's small scale problems (e.g., Wang et al. 2014).

The spectral signatures of annihilating or decaying dark matter can vary greatly between theoretical models. Annihilation of two dark matter particles into two photons would result in a spectral line of gamma rays with energy equal to the dark matter mass. Alternatively, annihilation could proceed into Standard Model quarks, leptons, or W/Z bosons, which provide a continuum of gamma ray energies through their decays and bremsstrahlung. Decay, on the other hand, is typically expected to result in a photon with an energy that is half of the mass of the dark matter particle, yielding an emission line at a specific wavelength rather than a spectrum. The morphology of any indirect signal can be used to distinguish the two options (annihilation or decay), as annihilation is proportional to the dark matter density squared, while decay is only proportional to the density itself.

As of this writing, there is an exciting hint of an annihilation spectrum seen from our Galactic Center. Likewise, there are also two unidentified lines, one at 130 GeV and the other at 3.5 keV, that are being discussed as possible indications of dark matter.

An excess distribution of gamma-rays from the Galactic Center has been seen in *Fermi* Gamma-Ray Space Telescope data that is not attributable to any known or understood source (Hooper & Linden 2011; Daylan et al. 2014). While the Galactic Center is a complicated place, full of baryonic physics that can contribute gamma-rays (Abazajian & Kaplinghat 2012; Boyarsky et al. 2011), this excess is roughly spherical in shape and extends out to at least $\sim 10^{\circ}$, and likely to several kpc (Daylan et al. 2014; Hooper & Slatyer 2013; Huang et al. 2013). It is seen after subtraction of a model for the gas disk, and of known gamma-ray point sources. While originally suggested to be a population of pulsars, the extended distribution seems to rule out this possibility.[4] The excess can be fit by a dark matter density distribution that follows a "cuspy" profile that scales as $\rho \propto r^{-\gamma}$, with $\gamma \sim 1.2$ (Daylan et al. 2014).

Unfortunately, no other searches for excess gamma-rays due to dark matter annihilation have yet revealed a signal. Despite the nearness of the Magellanic Clouds, they are gas-rich, making a gamma-ray signal from dark matter annihilation difficult to extract from the signal of cosmic rays interacting with the galactic interstellar medium (Tasitsiomi et al. 2004; The Fermi/LAT collaboration & Abdo 2010). The most popular place to search for annihilating dark matter is in the dwarf spheroidal galaxies of the Milky Way, as they are gas-free and dark matter-dominated (Strigari et al. 2007, 2008; Kuhlen et al. 2008; Kuhlen 2010). To date, no significant detection has been found, and the dwarfs yield an upper limit that place bounds on the WIMP model (Geringer-Sameth & Koushiappas 2011; Abdo et al. 2010; Ackermann et al. 2014; H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. 2011; Aharonian et al. 2009). However, the dark matter densities of the dwarf spheroidals may be too low to be detected with current measurements (Walker et al. 2011; Cholis & Salucci 2012). A better hope for detection would be to find a signal from a faint, as yet undiscovered dwarf that happens to be relatively nearby so that the flux in gamma-rays is large (He et al. 2013). Again, a search for such a signal in gamma-rays has not revealed any conclusive targets (Buckley & Hooper 2010; Belikov et al. 2012; Hooper & Linden 2012). The Dark Energy Survey (DES) offers the best hope of identifying such a dwarf in the near future, as it will be the first to survey the southern Galactic hemisphere for faint dwarfs (He et al. 2013).

Fermi data is also the source of the tentative 130 GeV line (Weniger 2012; Tempel et al. 2012). This line has been suggested to be an instrumental line (Whiteson 2012, 2013), but so far no one has been able to conclusively demonstrate this (Finkbeiner et al. 2013). Because *Fermi* is an all sky survey, one might expect the significance of this line to increase with time with more data if it is truly due to a dark matter source. Instead, the significance has fluctuated (Fermi-LAT Collaboration 2013). At the moment, there are no other gamma-ray telescopes within this energy range that can test whether the line may be instrumental. Given the intriguing nature of this line and the inability to rule out systematic effects, *Fermi* has recently altered its survey strategy to spend more time on the Galactic Center in an attempt to better understand whether this line is related to dark matter. Intriguingly, $\sim$100 GeV has long been favored as the WIMP mass, as a WIMP model with this mass provides a natural fit to the relic dark matter density in the Universe after freeze-out (Gondolo & Gelmini 1991; Kolb & Turner 1994).

As this review was being written, another possible line associated with decaying dark matter was observed, in the x-ray at 3.5 keV. This line has been seen both in individual objects (the Andromeda galaxy and the Perseus galaxy cluster, Boyarsky et al. 2014), and the stacked spectrum of 73 clusters (Bulbul et al. 2014). Most of the data comes from the *XMM* x-ray telescope, though Bulbul et al. (2014) also searched for it in *Chandra* data. The same line was detected in the *Chandra* data for the Perseus cluster, consistent with the *XMM* flux, but it was not detected in *Chandra* data for the Virgo cluster. Unlike the 130 GeV line, a line at 3.5 keV can be searched for with multiple current telescopes (both *Chandra* and two separate detectors on *XMM*, but also *Suzaku*), al-

[3] This requires an annihilation cross-section larger than that of a typical CDM WIMP (Buckley 2011).

[4] Note that this excess should also not be confused with the Fermi bubbles (Su et al. 2010), which are likely caused by a past energetic event such as accretion in the Galactic Center.

lowing to test if the detection is an instrumental line. The stacked analysis in Bulbul et al. (2014) already argues against an instrumental line, as the varying redshifts of the sources should wash out any instrumental feature. Note that in this case, the mass of the dark matter particle would be 7 keV, making it a WDM particle candidate. Sterile neutrinos are a popular candidate for WDM. I will discuss in the next section whether a 7 keV sterile neutrino is consistent with observed galaxy properties.

3. WDM

WDM is usually invoked to explain a lack of low mass halos that are a generic prediction of CDM (see Fig. 1). This problem extends beyond just the missing satellites problem (Moore et al. 1999; Klypin et al. 1999) and into the field (Klypin et al. 2014). In CDM, the mass function of dark matter halos increases toward smaller mass halos. Using a characteristic velocity at a given halo mass, the velocity function, $n(V) \propto V^{\alpha}$ rises toward small halos with $\alpha \sim -3$. The HI ALFALFA survey (Giovanelli et al. 2005) has allowed for a test of the CDM velocity function to lower masses than previous optical surveys. The velocity function measured by the ALFALFA survey is much more shallow ($\alpha \sim -0.8$) than CDM predicts (Papastergis et al. 2011). The shallower slope is better described by the halo mass function predicted in WDM models (Schneider et al. 2014). Likewise, a semi-analytic model of galaxy formation in a WDM scenario is a better fit to observed central and satellite luminosity functions (Menci et al. 2012; Nierenberg et al. 2013).

While CDM has power all the way down to very small scales (e.g., Earth mass halos, Anderhalden & Diemand 2013), the higher streaming velocities of WDM at high redshift prevent it from initially collapsing into small halos with shallow gravitational wells (Bode et al. 2001). The halo mass at which WDM can begin to gravitationally coalesce is set by the mass (and hence velocity) of the WDM particle. Thus, quantifying the amount of small scale structure in the Universe can place constraints on the mass of a WDM particle. Early studies to determine whether dark matter was hot or cold showed that relativistic dark matter (e.g., neutrinos) would erase structures up to tens of Mpc, yet we see structure on smaller scales in the Universe (and it is well described by the CDM power spectrum, White et al. 1983). Given the success of CDM in describing the observed power on large scales (Hlozek et al. 2012) while failing on small scales, WDM can be thought of as the Goldilocks solution.

A popular candidate for a WDM particle is the sterile neutrino, or a right-handed neutrino. In the standard model, all fermions are expected to come in both left and right-handed varieties. The left-handed neutrino participates in weak interactions, while the right-handed neutrino does not (hence, it is sterile), making it difficult to detect. While the canonical CDM candidate, the WIMP, is expected to be a thermal relic of the early Universe, it is very difficult to devise a scenario in which the sterile neutrino is a thermal relic, and an alternative scenario must be invoked (Dodelson & Widrow 1994). However, the transfer function (the modification to the power spectrum) resulting from these alternative models has the same shape as a thermal production mechanism. This allows the mass of the sterile neutrino to be directly compared to the mass of a thermal relic (Colombi et al. 1996). If the source of the 3.5 keV line mentioned above was a thermal relic, it would have a mass in the range of 1.5 – 3.0 keV (Abazajian 2014). In what follows, I will quote the equivalent thermal relic WDM mass for comparison to CDM models.

There are multiple independent observations that can constrain the WDM mass, e.g., phase-space constraints (Boyarsky et al. 2009; Horiuchi et al. 2014), gravitational lensing (Miranda & Macciò 2007), satellite abundance (Macciò & Fontanot 2010; Polisensky & Ricotti 2011; Anderhalden & Diemand 2013; Horiuchi et al. 2014), the amount of small scale structure in the Lyman-α forest (Viel et al. 2006; Seljak et al. 2006; Viel et al. 2008), and the earliest epoch of star formation (Barkana et al. 2001; Mesinger et al. 2005; de Souza et al. 2013; Pacucci et al. 2013). Some of the tightest constraints on the WDM mass come from observations of the Lyman-α forest at $2.5 < z < 5.5$ interpreted using hydrodynamical simulations. For many years these results suggested that a WDM particle with mass > 1 keV was allowed (Viel et al. 2006; Seljak et al. 2006; Viel et al. 2008). However, a recent update set new limits on the WDM mass to be > 3.3 keV at the 2σ level (Viel et al. 2013). Hence, the limits from the Lyman-α forest may be at odds with the tentative 3.5 keV x-ray line depending on the thermal relic equivalent mass (Abazajian 2014).

3.1. *WDM as a solution to CDM's small scale problems*

The erasure of substructure in WDM has the ability to solve at least one of the major problems in CDM, the missing satellites problem (Moore et al. 1999; Klypin et al. 1999). In recent years, a number of new satellites have been detected at fainter luminosities (Willman et al. 2005; Irwin et al. 2007; Liu et al. 2008; Simon & Geha 2007; Belokurov et al. 2008; Watkins et al. 2009; Belokurov et al. 2010). All of these "ultra-faint" dwarfs have been detected in the *Sloan Digital Sky Survey* (SDSS). Accounting for the footprint and magnitude limits of SDSS suggests that there may be hundreds of faint galaxies orbiting the Milky Way that remain undetected (Willman et al. 2004; Simon & Geha 2007; Tollerud et al. 2008; Walsh et al. 2009). The existence of hundreds of ultra-faint galaxies requires that the mass of the WDM candidate would need to be greater than $\sim$2 keV (Macciò & Fontanot 2010; Polisensky & Ricotti 2011; Anderhalden & Diemand 2013; Horiuchi et al. 2014).

Because the phase–space density of dark matter should never be higher than its initial density at decoupling, it was originally suggested that WDM might naturally lead to the existence of matter cores in galaxies (Tremaine & Gunn 1979; Dalcanton & Hogan 2001; Boyarsky et al. 2009). However, WDM cannot explain the large cores that we observe in galaxies (e.g., $\sim$1kpc core in a dwarf galaxy with stellar mass of 10^8 $M_{\odot}$) without violating the mass limits imposed by other observational constraints. To create a 1kpc dark matter core, the mass of the WDM particle would need to be $\sim$0.1 keV (Macciò et al. 2012), a low mass which is already ruled out by both the Lyman-α forest and the amount of substructure observed around the Milky Way. At 2 keV, roughly the lower limit allowed by the abundance of substructure, the core size drops below 10pc. Hence, if



FIG. 1.— A 10^{10} $M_\odot$ halo run with SIDM (left), CDM (middle), and WDM (right). These simulations are dark matter only. Each image is 50kpc across. Color corresponds to density. The lowest densities (blue) are $100\rho_{crit}$, and the highest densities (white) are $10^6\rho_{crit}$. The SIDM model (left) has been run with $\sigma = 2$ cm^2/g (Fry et al., in prep). Note the more spherical shape of the halo compared to the CDM run, as well as the lower densities reached at the very center ($\sim 10^5\rho_{crit}$). The WDM model (right) has been run with the power spectrum corresponding to a 2 keV thermal relic mass.

WDM is on the order of ∼2 keV, then a separate mechanism for creating dark matter cores in galaxies is still required. Energetic feedback from supernovae provides a natural mechanism for dark matter core creation within the allowed WDM mass range (Pontzen & Governato 2012; Governato et al. 2012).

WDM has also been invoked to solve the Too Big to Fail problem found in the Milky Way and M31 satellites. The central densities of halos should be lower in WDM models because structure formation occurs later. In CDM, small structures form first, but in WDM models this smallest structure is wiped out, causing structure formation to be delayed compared to CDM (Lovell et al. 2012). It has been established that the concentration of a halo is related to formation time, with earlier forming halos being more concentrated than later forming halos (Wechsler et al. 2002; Zhao et al. 2003). Hence, WDM halos are less concentrated, and there is less mass enclosed at a fixed radius (Lovell et al. 2014). In the case of the dwarf spheroidals, the mass is measured most robustly at the half light radii, which are typically $\lesssim$1kpc for the luminous dwarfs (McConnachie 2012). The mass enclosed at these small radii is sufficiently lowered to solve the Too Big to Fail Problem (Lovell et al. 2012), which requires masses to be lower by a factor of ∼2-4. However, to fully solve the problem with no other contributing solution, the mass of the WDM particle cannot be larger than ∼2 keV (Schneider et al. 2014). In other words, tension exists between the allowed mass range for WDM from the Lyman-α forest ($>$ 3.3 keV) and the mass range required in order to solve the problems of the satellites. If the dark matter mass is indeed above ∼3 keV, then an additional process is still required to bring the masses of the luminous satellites in line with observations. Fortunately, a baryonic solution (enhanced tidal stripping in the presence of a disk) exists that could solve this problem (Peñarrubia et al. 2010; Arraki et al. 2014; Brooks & Zolotov 2014).

3.2. *Future Prospects*

If further investigation of the 3.5 keV x-ray line proves that it is difficult to explain as something other than dark matter, the mass of this WDM particle needs to be reconciled with other observational constraints. The thermal relic equivalent mass of an originating sterile neutrino (1.5-3.0 keV, Abazajian 2014) is already in tension with the limits set by the Lyman-α forest, suggesting that we would need to re-evaluate our interpretation of the hydrodynamic simulations used to place the Lyman-α forest constraints. Further, a 1.5 keV WDM particle is hard to reconcile with the number of ultra-faint halos already observed around the Milky Way, though ∼3 keV is not. A 1.5 keV WDM particle would suggest that we have been biased in finding faint dwarfs, so that our extrapolations to the full number not yet detected are overly generous. A more complete census of the number of ultra-faint galaxies and their distribution on the sky is required before this can be reconciled. Fortunately, there are a number of upcoming surveys (*Skymapper*, DES, and LSST) that should be able to inventory hundreds of faint satellites if they exist.

A liberal reading of the observational constraints suggests that a minimum mass of ∼2 keV is allowed, but a more conservative reading of the Lyman-α forest limits suggests an even heavier particle. Even 2 keV is broadly consistent with the number of satellites around the Milky Way, and anything heavier is nearly indistinguishable from CDM in terms of the amount of small-scale structure formed. In fact, assuming a WDM particle of 2 keV, there is very little difference in the resulting structure of any individual galaxy between CDM and WDM. The concentration – mass relation for WDM dark matter halos is essentially identical to CDM in this mass range (Schneider et al. 2012). When baryons are added, a slight contraction of the dark matter halo is seen in the CDM case compared to the WDM case (Herpich et al. 2014; Lovell et al. 2014). Herpich et al. (2014) simulated Milky Way-mass and smaller galaxies in both CDM and WDM models that include baryons. They attribute halo contraction in CDM to the existence of subhalos that drive disk instabilities, causing gas to flow the center of galaxies and leading to contraction. By the same argument, the WDM simulations with baryons have less star formation at $z < 1$ due to a lack of subhalo induced instabilities.

If the only change between the CDM+baryon and allowed WDM+baryon models is in slightly less concentrated galaxies and slightly lower star formation rates at

low z, then it will be extremely difficult to disentangle WDM from baryons. In fact, Herpich et al. (2014) and Governato et al. (2014) demonstrated that the resulting change in the star formation history and concentration of a galaxy is more sensitive to the details of star formation than it is to the range of allowed WDM masses.

Given the lack of evidence for a WDM particle at low z, it appears that the best route to constrain the WDM model further is to probe the faintest structures at high z to quantify the formation times of the smallest halos. While a number of studies have already attempted to use high z star formation to constrain the WDM particle mass (Barkana et al. 2001; Mesinger et al. 2005; de Souza et al. 2013), astronomers are now pursuing a series of observations that will allow us to probe to fainter structure than ever before. These observations use lensing clusters to identify magnified galaxies at high z. The Cluster Lensing And Supernovae survey with Hubble (CLASH Postman et al. 2012) has already idenfied two candidate galaxies at $z \gtrsim 10$ (Zheng et al. 2012; Coe et al. 2013).[5] Pacucci et al. (2013) recently argued that a very high number density of halos is required to be seen in the small volumes that the lensing studies are probing. Two candidate galaxies at $z \gtrsim 10$ restricts the WDM mass to be heavier than 1 keV. However, the ongoing *Hubble Space Telescope* Frontier Fields observations[6] will push ∼3 magnitudes deeper. These lensing observations should put stronger bounds on the allowed WDM mass. If additional $z \sim 10$ galaxy candidates are identified and confirmed, WDM is likely to be ruled out.

4. SIDM

SIDM is usually invoked to solve the cusp/core problem in CDM. Motivation behind a model for SIDM can be found in examining the standard model of particle physics. Given the number of particles that exist, it seems natural to ask ourselves if dark matter may be more complicated than we tend to assume. Is dark matter another particle with small interactions with the standard model (like a sterile neutrino)? Or might the "dark sector" contain a similarly complex model that contains multiple particles? In a more complex model, there may be a mediator particle that can be exchanged by the dark matter. In galaxies, this particle exhange would occur most frequently where dark matter is most closely packed together, i.e., in the center of galaxies. The exchange redistributes the energy of the dark matter particles. Assuming an elastic scattering of particles, the overall effect is to heat the inner regions of galaxies so that particles move outward, transforming a cuspy inner density profile into a cored profile (Spergel & Steinhardt 2000).

The redistribution of dark matter in SIDM models has several other observational implications in addition to core creation. The scattering tends to equalize the velocity of particles, leading to a constant velocity dispersion profile within the scale radius of the galaxy (where collisions are relatively frequent), rather than an increasing profile as predicted by CDM (Vogelsberger et al. 2012; Rocha et al. 2013). The redistribution also acts to transform a triaxial dark matter halo into a more spherical distribution (see Fig. 1).

The predicted circularization of the halo shapes led to a quick dismissal of the SIDM model when it was first invoked in the early 2000's. Core sizes observed in dwarf galaxies can be used to set constraints on the cross section for interactions, σ in cm^2/g, in SIDM. These same limits, when applied to clusters, suggested very circularized halos (Yoshida et al. 2000). Maps of clusters showed that they were much more elliptical than predicted by SIDM (Miralda-Escudé 2002). Because of these results, SIDM was generally neglected for the following decade. However, the question of halo shapes has been revisited recently. Peter et al. (2013) demonstrated that the σ values required to match dwarf galaxies do not lead to enough change in the halo shapes of clusters to significantly distinguish them from CDM.

There are currently two models for SIDM being explored. The simplest case posits that, no matter the relative velocities of the two dark matter particles, there is a constant cross-section for interaction. On the other hand, it is not unreasonable to assume that it becomes easier for dark matter particles to scatter as their relative velocities become smaller. Introducing a Yukawa potential to the model (Loeb & Weiner 2011) leads to a velocity-dependent cross-section. This has the additional benefit of leading to core formation in dwarf galaxies, while not altering the shapes of the larger cluster halos where velocities are larger, and avoiding the earlier problems posed by a constant-velocity cross-section.

4.1. *SIDM as a solution to CDM's small scale problems*

As discussed above, SIDM is invoked to solve the cusp/core problem in CDM (Spergel & Steinhardt 2000). Assuming a constant-velocity cross-section, a minimum $\sigma > 0.1$ cm^2/g is required in order to achieve the large cores we see in dwarf galaxies (Loeb & Weiner 2011). This is bounded by observations on the massive end, where the shapes of cluster halos suggest $\sigma < 1$ cm^2/g (Peter et al. 2013; Rocha et al. 2013; Vogelsberger et al. 2012).

SIDM does not do nearly as well as WDM at solving the problems with the Milky Way's satellites, though. Around the time that early studies of SIDM were pointing to overly spherical cluster shapes, other authors noted that subhalos that traveled through the dense regions of their parent halos should experience interactions that could lead to easier disruption of the satellites. Some authors concluded that the large number of observed subhalos in clusters was also a strike against SIDM (Gnedin & Ostriker 2001). Again, more recent work shows that the number of disrupted halos is small enough that the discrepancy in subhalo numbers between SIDM and CDM would be hard to detect (Rocha et al. 2013). When comparing CDM and SIDM simulations that both neglect baryons, the surviving subhalo mass function for elastic scattering models in the range of allowed σ values (0.1 to 1 cm^2/g) is identical (Zavala et al. 2013). Thus, SIDM does not solve the missing satellites problem.

While not significantly reducing the number of satellites, it has been suggested that SIDM may help alleviate the Too Big to Fail problem. Rocha et al. (2013)

[5] Note that a combinination of *HST* surveys have also identified six candidate galaxies at $z \sim 10$ without lensing (Bouwens et al. 2014).

[6] www.stsci.edu/hst/campaigns/frontier-fields

suggested a constant-velocity model with $\sigma = 0.1$ would create large enough cores to lower the central densities of satellites to bring them into line with observations. However, this was based on an extrapolation of simulation results below their resolution limits. Zavala et al. (2013) instead showed that $\sigma = 0.1$ could not reduce the central masses of the satellites enough to match observations. They suggested a minimum $\sigma > 0.6$ cm^2/g is necessary to alleviate the Too Big to Fail problem. However, even this value would not fully explain Fornax. As one of the brightest satellites, Fornax is expected to have been formed in one of the largest subhalos. It's observed low velocity dispersion cannot be fully fit by the 0.6 cm^2/g model. This tension suggests that even with core creation, some additional mechanism is still necessary to reduce the densities of the most luminous satellites enough to match observations. Again, a baryonic solution exists that could solve this problem (Peñarrubia et al. 2010; Zolotov et al. 2012; Arraki et al. 2014; Brooks & Zolotov 2014).

4.2. *Future Prospects*

Initial analytic work suggests that the effect of baryons may substantially alter the predictions from SIDM models that neglect baryons. Kaplinghat et al. (2013) found that contraction of the baryons in a dark matter halo will shrink the size of the dark matter core formed by scatterings in SIDM. For the Milky Way, the core size when neglecting baryons can be as large as the scale radius, ∼20kpc. Contraction of baryons shinks the core to 0.5kpc (Kaplinghat et al. 2013). This is a dramatic difference that needs to be confirmed by SIDM simulations that include baryons. Because supernova feedback can also lead to dark matter core creation (Pontzen & Governato 2012), the effects of SIDM, contraction, and supernovae will all need to be carefully understood and disentangled.

To date, Vogelsberger et al. (2014) are the only group to have published simulations of SIDM that include baryons. However, the simulations do not include baryonic feedback that leads to dark matter core creation, so the combined influence of core creation from both supernovae and SIDM scatterings has not been examined. Despite this, their model already demonstrates that the stellar component may be altered from the CDM case, suggesting that the stellar distribution of galaxies may allow us to probe the dark matter content. More simulations, particularly with feedback that independently leads to cores, are necessary to explore these trends further.

It is also critical to note that all of the current bounds on σ have been derived by comparing dark matter-only SIDM simulations to observations. If baryons lead to a dramatic change in the central regions of galaxies compared to dark matter-only SIDM models, then all of the current bounds will need to be re-examined. This is particularly true in massive galaxies and clusters. Clusters of galaxies with masses $> 10^{14}$ M$_\odot$ have scale radii ∼150 kpc. If core size is comparable to the scale radius, core sizes this large are already ruled out (Rocha et al. 2013). However, might baryons shrink the core size in clusters to an allowed size? Recent measurements of brightest cluster galaxies have found evidence for cores, but on the scales of a few kpc to several tens of kpc (Newman et al. 2013). It is difficult for baryonic physics to explain core sizes of tens of kpc. Might these core sizes instead be indicative of SIDM with baryonic contraction? Better modeling is required to answer this question.

Galaxies more massive than the Milky Way are dominated by baryons in their central regions, making it difficult to put tight constraints on the dark matter profile given uncertainties in removing the baryon contribution. This makes low mass dwarf galaxies the more ideal place to test SIDM models, as they are dark matter-dominated and the complications of baryons are minimized. Dark matter-dominated dwarfs already outline a clear prediction to identify SIDM from CDM: even if baryonic physics can create dark matter cores in galaxies, it will do so in a distinctly different mass regime from SIDM. In the allowed velocity-dependent models of Vogelsberger et al. (2012), or in the constant-velocity models with $\sigma \sim 1$ cm^2/g, even halos as small as Draco (with stellar mass $3{\times}10^5$ M$_\odot$) have large dark matter cores. This is not true in CDM+baryon models. The creation of a core in baryonic models is tied to the amount of energy that has been injected, i.e., to the amount of stars that have formed. Halos the size of Draco are too small to have had enough star formation to create a large core (Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2013). The exact scaling of core size and mass will depend on how well stellar/supernovae feedback couples to the ISM. Assuming a coupling of 40%, Peñarrubia et al. (2012) showed that roughly 10^7 M$_\odot$ in stars is necessary to create kpc-sized cores. Adopting this standard, it implies that kpc-sized cores cannot be created in halos as faint as Draco. If such large cores were to be identified in these faint halos, it would be strong evidence for SIDM.

Unfortunately, determining whether such faint halos have cores is a daunting observational challenge. It has been claimed that Draco has both a core (Wolf & Bullock 2012) and a cusp (Jardel et al. 2013). The results are not only disparate for Draco, but even for the more massive and luminous dwarf Spheroidal satellites (Strigari et al. 2010; Walker & Peñarrubia 2011; Hayashi & Chiba 2012; Jardel & Gebhardt 2012; Breddels & Helmi 2013). The interpretation is most sensitive to assumptions about the anisotropy of the stellar orbits, an unknown (Evans et al. 2009; Battaglia et al. 2013; Richardson & Fairbairn 2013b,a).

Regardless of the *slope* of the dark matter density profile in these dwarfs, there is mounting observational evidence that the *normalization* of the dark matter density is lower than predicted by CDM, i.e., that dwarf galaxies have lower masses than predicted within a given radius. For dwarf satellites, this may be caused by tidal stripping while orbiting around the parent halo's disk (Brooks & Zolotov 2014). However, even field dwarf galaxies that should not have been influenced by tidal stripping seem to have lower masses than predicted by CDM. Abundance matching of stellar masses to halo masses suggests that galaxies in the stellar mass range below 10^7 M$_\odot$ have rotational velocities consistently lower than expected in CDM (Ferrero et al. 2012; Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2014; Papastergis et al. 2014). If this trend cannot be be explained by baryonic physics, then again SIDM would provide a natural explanation.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Baryonic phyiscs has been shown to be able to solve all of the problems of galaxy formation within CDM that are highlighted in this review: (1) the cusp/core problem (Navarro et al. 1996; Read & Gilmore 2005; de Souza et al. 2011; Governato et al. 2010; Pontzen & Governato 2012; Teyssier et al. 2013; Di Cintio et al. 2014), (2) the existence of bulgeless disk galaxies (Governato et al. 2010; Brook et al. 2011; Teyssier et al. 2013), (3) the missing satellites problem (Brooks et al. 2013), and (4) the "Too Big to Fail" problem (Zolotov et al. 2012; Arraki et al. 2014; Brooks & Zolotov 2014). Only baryons have the potential to solve all of these problems together. Of the two alternative models to CDM that are discussed in this article, neither can solve these problems simultaneously. WDM may alleviate the problems in the satellites, but cannot create dark matter cores. SIDM can create dark matter cores, but cannot alleviate the satellite problems. Importantly, neither WDM nor SIDM can create bulgeless disk galaxies without baryonic feedback.

Because baryons have been shown to so dramatically alter the evolution of the dark matter structure in the center of galaxies and in satellites, it is clear that dark matter-only simulations cannot be used to make accurate predictions on small scales. Future preditions for galaxy formation *in any model* must consider the role of baryons. This review has highlighted the future prospects of constraining two popular dark matter models as an alternative to CDM.

The current limits on the mass of a WDM particle are relatively heavy, $\gtrsim$2 keV. At 2 keV, structure formation in WDM is nearly indistinguishable from CDM. Theorists have already begun to include baryons in predictions for WDM, but the main difference is that less star formation occurs in WDM models (Herpich et al. 2014; Governato et al. 2014). Current simulations are more sensitive to the star formation prescription than they are to the mass of the WDM particle. Hence, identifying WDM from CDM based on simulation predictions requires a better understanding of star formation than we currently have. Rather, the best path forward for ruling out or favoring WDM is through observations. Further observations of the tentative 3.5 keV x-ray line, and the amount of star formation at $z > 10$, are currently the optimal observations to pursue.

Simulations of galaxies formed with SIDM that include baryons are needed. While analytic predictions are beginning to appear (Kaplinghat et al. 2013), their dramatic predictions need to be confirmed. If baryons are as important as claimed in reducing SIDM core sizes, the bounds on σ will need to be re-evaluated. On the theoretical side, progress will be made utilizing simulations over a range of galaxy masses. Presumably the scaling relations of galaxies might show systematic differences between SIDM and CDM, allowing the model to be constrained. On the observational side, the existence of kpc-sized cores in galaxies with less than 10^7 $M_\odot$ in stellar mass would favor SIDM models. These faint galaxies already show hints of being less massive than predicted by CDM (Ferrero et al. 2012; Papastergis et al. 2014). Hence, understanding the mass distributions in these faint field galaxies is the immediate best observational test of SIDM.

REFERENCES

Abazajian, K. N. 2014, Physical Review Letters, 112, 161303
Abazajian, K. N., & Kaplinghat, M. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 86, 083511
Abdo, A. A. et al. 2010, ApJ, 712, 147
Ackermann, M. et al. 2014, Phys. Rev. D, 89, 042001
Agertz, O., Kravtsov, A. V., Leitner, S. N., & Gnedin, N. Y. 2013, ApJ, 770, 25
Aharonian, F. et al. 2009, ApJ, 691, 175
Anderhalden, D., & Diemand, J. 2013, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 4, 9
Arraki, K. S., Klypin, A., More, S., & Trujillo-Gomez, S. 2014, MNRAS, 438, 1466
Aumer, M., White, S. D. M., Naab, T., & Scannapieco, C. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 3142
Barkana, R., Haiman, Z., & Ostriker, J. P. 2001, ApJ, 558, 482
Barkana, R., & Loeb, A. 1999, ApJ, 523, 54
Barnes, J., & Efstathiou, G. 1987, ApJ, 319, 575
Barr, S. M., Sekhar Chivukula, R., & Farhi, E. 1990, Physics Letters B, 241, 387
Battaglia, G., Helmi, A., & Breddels, M. 2013, New Astronomy Reviews, 57, 52
Belikov, A. V., Buckley, M. R., & Hooper, D. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 86, 043504
Belokurov, V. et al. 2008, ApJ, 686, L83
—. 2010, ApJ, 712, L103
Bode, P., Ostriker, J. P., & Turok, N. 2001, ApJ, 556, 93
Bouwens, R. J. et al. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1403.4295
Boyarsky, A., Malyshev, D., & Ruchayskiy, O. 2011, Physics Letters B, 705, 165
Boyarsky, A., Ruchayskiy, O., & Iakubovskyi, D. 2009, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 3, 5
Boyarsky, A., Ruchayskiy, O., Iakubovskyi, D., & Franse, J. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1402.4119
Boylan-Kolchin, M., Bullock, J. S., & Kaplinghat, M. 2011, MNRAS, 415, L40
—. 2012, MNRAS, 2657
Breddels, M. A., & Helmi, A. 2013, A&A, 558, A35
Brook, C. B. et al. 2011, MNRAS, 415, 1051
Brooks, A. M., Kuhlen, M., Zolotov, A., & Hooper, D. 2013, ApJ, 765, 22
Brooks, A. M., & Zolotov, A. 2014, ApJ, 786
Buckley, M. R. 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 84, 043510
Buckley, M. R., & Hooper, D. 2010, Phys. Rev. D, 82, 063501
Buckley, M. R., & Randall, L. 2011, Journal of High Energy Physics, 9, 9
Bulbul, E., Markevitch, M., Foster, A., Smith, R. K., Loewenstein, M., & Randall, S. W. 2014, ApJ, 789, 13
Cholis, I., & Salucci, P. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 86, 023528
Christensen, C., Quinn, T., Governato, F., Stilp, A., Shen, S., & Wadsley, J. 2012, MNRAS, 425, 3058
Coe, D. et al. 2013, ApJ, 762, 32
Collins, M. L. M. et al. 2014, ApJ, 783, 7
Colombi, S., Dodelson, S., & Widrow, L. M. 1996, ApJ, 458, 1
Dalcanton, J. J., & Hogan, C. J. 2001, ApJ, 561, 35
Daylan, T., Finkbeiner, D. P., Hooper, D., Linden, T., Portillo, S. K. N., Rodd, N. L., & Slatyer, T. R. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1402.6703
de Blok, W. J. G., & Bosma, A. 2002, A&A, 385, 816
de Blok, W. J. G., McGaugh, S. S., & Rubin, V. C. 2001, AJ, 122, 2396
de Blok, W. J. G., Walter, F., Brinks, E., Trachternach, C., Oh, S., & Kennicutt, R. C. 2008, AJ, 136, 2648
de Souza, R. S., Mesinger, A., Ferrara, A., Haiman, Z., Perna, R., & Yoshida, N. 2013, MNRAS, 432, 3218
de Souza, R. S., Rodrigues, L. F. S., Ishida, E. E. O., & Opher, R. 2011, MNRAS, 415, 2969

Di Cintio, A., Brook, C. B., Macciò, A. V., Stinson, G. S., Knebe, A., Dutton, A. A., & Wadsley, J. 2014, MNRAS, 437, 415
Di Cintio, A., Knebe, A., Libeskind, N. I., Brook, C., Yepes, G., Gottlöber, S., & Hoffman, Y. 2013, MNRAS, 431, 1220
Dodelson, S., & Widrow, L. M. 1994, Physical Review Letters, 72, 17
Dutton, A. A. 2009, MNRAS, 396, 121
Evans, N. W., An, J., & Walker, M. G. 2009, MNRAS, 393, L50
Feng, J. L., & Kumar, J. 2008, Physical Review Letters, 101, 231301
Fermi-LAT Collaboration. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1305.5597
Ferrero, I., Abadi, M. G., Navarro, J. F., Sales, L. V., & Gurovich, S. 2012, MNRAS, 425, 2817
Finkbeiner, D. P., Su, M., & Weniger, C. 2013, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 1, 29
Garrison-Kimmel, S., Boylan-Kolchin, M., Bullock, J. S., & Kirby, E. N. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1404.5313
Garrison-Kimmel, S., Rocha, M., Boylan-Kolchin, M., Bullock, J. S., & Lally, J. 2013, MNRAS, 433, 3539
Gentile, G., Salucci, P., Klein, U., & Granato, G. L. 2007, MNRAS, 375, 199
Geringer-Sameth, A., & Koushiappas, S. M. 2011, Physical Review Letters, 107, 241303
Giovanelli, R. et al. 2005, AJ, 130, 2598
Gnedin, N. Y. 2000, ApJ, 542, 535
Gnedin, O. Y., & Ostriker, J. P. 2001, ApJ, 561, 61
Gondolo, P., & Gelmini, G. 1991, Nuclear Physics B, 360, 145
Governato, F. et al. 2010, Nature, 463, 203
—. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1407.0022
—. 2012, MNRAS, 422, 1231
Guedes, J., Callegari, S., Madau, P., & Mayer, L. 2011, ApJ, 742, 76
Hayashi, K., & Chiba, M. 2012, ApJ, 755, 145
He, C., Bechtol, K., Hearin, A. P., & Hooper, D. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1309.4780
Herpich, J., Stinson, G. S., Macciò, A. V., Brook, C., Wadsley, J., Couchman, H. M. P., & Quinn, T. 2014, MNRAS, 437, 293
H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. 2011, Astroparticle Physics, 34, 608
Hinshaw, G. et al. 2013, ApJS, 208, 19
Hlozek, R. et al. 2012, ApJ, 749, 90
Hooper, D., & Linden, T. 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 84, 123005
—. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 86, 083532
Hooper, D., & Slatyer, T. R. 2013, Physics of the Dark Universe, 2, 118
Hopkins, P. F., Keres, D., Onorbe, J., Faucher-Giguere, C.-A., Quataert, E., Murray, N., & Bullock, J. S. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1311.2073
Horiuchi, S., Humphrey, P. J., Oñorbe, J., Abazajian, K. N., Kaplinghat, M., & Garrison-Kimmel, S. 2014, Phys. Rev. D, 89, 025017
Huang, W.-C., Urbano, A., & Xue, W. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1307.6862
Ibarra, A., Tran, D., & Weniger, C. 2013, International Journal of Modern Physics A, 28, 30040
Irwin, M. J. et al. 2007, ApJ, 656, L13
Jardel, J. R., & Gebhardt, K. 2012, ApJ, 746, 89
Jardel, J. R., Gebhardt, K., Fabricius, M. H., Drory, N., & Williams, M. J. 2013, ApJ, 763, 91
Kaplan, D. B. 1992, Physical Review Letters, 68, 741
Kaplinghat, M., Keeley, R. E., Linden, T., & Yu, H.-B. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1311.6524
Klypin, A., Karachentsev, I., Makarov, D., & Nasonova, O. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1405.4523
Klypin, A., Kravtsov, A. V., Valenzuela, O., & Prada, F. 1999, ApJ, 522, 82
Kolb, E. W., & Turner, M. S. 1994, The early universe. (Westview Press)
Kribs, G. D., Roy, T. S., Terning, J., & Zurek, K. M. 2010, Phys. Rev. D, 81, 095001
Kuhlen, M. 2010, Advances in Astronomy, 2010
Kuhlen, M., Diemand, J., & Madau, P. 2008, ApJ, 686, 262
Kuzio de Naray, R., McGaugh, S. S., de Blok, W. J. G., & Bosma, A. 2006, ApJS, 165, 461
Liu, C., Hu, J., Newberg, H., & Zhao, Y. 2008, A&A, 477, 139
Loeb, A., & Weiner, N. 2011, Physical Review Letters, 106, 171302
Lovell, M. R. et al. 2012, MNRAS, 420, 2318
Lovell, M. R., Frenk, C. S., Eke, V. R., Jenkins, A., Gao, L., & Theuns, T. 2014, MNRAS, 439, 300
Macciò, A. V., & Fontanot, F. 2010, MNRAS, 404, L16
Macciò, A. V., Paduroiu, S., Anderhalden, D., Schneider, A., & Moore, B. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 1105
McConnachie, A. W. 2012, AJ, 144, 4
Menci, N., Fiore, F., & Lamastra, A. 2012, MNRAS, 421, 2384
Mesinger, A., Perna, R., & Haiman, Z. 2005, ApJ, 623, 1
Miralda-Escudé, J. 2002, ApJ, 564, 60
Miranda, M., & Macciò, A. V. 2007, MNRAS, 382, 1225
Moore, B., Ghigna, S., Governato, F., Lake, G., Quinn, T., Stadel, J., & Tozzi, P. 1999, ApJ, 524, L19
Navarro, J. F., Eke, V. R., & Frenk, C. S. 1996, MNRAS, 283, L72
Navarro, J. F., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 1997, ApJ, 490, 493
Navarro, J. F. et al. 2010, MNRAS, 402, 21
Newman, A. B., Treu, T., Ellis, R. S., & Sand, D. J. 2013, ApJ, 765, 25
Nierenberg, A. M., Treu, T., Menci, N., Lu, Y., & Wang, W. 2013, ApJ, 772, 146
Nussinov, S. 1985, Physics Letters B, 165, 55
Oh, S.-H., Brook, C., Governato, F., Brinks, E., Mayer, L., de Blok, W. J. G., Brooks, A., & Walter, F. 2011, AJ, 142, 24
Okamoto, T., Gao, L., & Theuns, T. 2008, MNRAS, 390, 920
Pacucci, F., Mesinger, A., & Haiman, Z. 2013, MNRAS, 435, L53
Papastergis, E., Giovanelli, R., Haynes, M. P., & Shankar, F. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1407.4665
Papastergis, E., Martin, A. M., Giovanelli, R., & Haynes, M. P. 2011, ApJ, 739, 38
Peñarrubia, J., Benson, A. J., Walker, M. G., Gilmore, G., McConnachie, A. W., & Mayer, L. 2010, MNRAS, 406, 1290
Peñarrubia, J., Pontzen, A., Walker, M. G., & Koposov, S. E. 2012, ApJ, 759, L42
Peebles, P. J. E. 1969, ApJ, 155, 393
Peter, A. H. G., Rocha, M., Bullock, J. S., & Kaplinghat, M. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 105
Planck Collaboration et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1303.5076
Polisensky, E., & Ricotti, M. 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 83, 043506
Pontzen, A., & Governato, F. 2012, MNRAS, 421, 3464
—. 2014, Nature, 506, 171
Postman, M. et al. 2012, ApJS, 199, 25
Primack, J. R. 2012, Annalen der Physik, 524, 535
Quinn, T., & Binney, J. 1992, MNRAS, 255, 729
Quinn, T., Katz, N., & Efstathiou, G. 1996, MNRAS, 278, L49
Read, J. I., & Gilmore, G. 2005, MNRAS, 356, 107
Richardson, T., & Fairbairn, M. 2013a, MNRAS, 432, 3361
—. 2013b, ArXiv e-prints, 1305.0670
Rocha, M., Peter, A. H. G., Bullock, J. S., Kaplinghat, M., Garrison-Kimmel, S., Oñorbe, J., & Moustakas, L. A. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 81
Schneider, A., Anderhalden, D., Macciò, A. V., & Diemand, J. 2014, MNRAS, 441, L6
Schneider, A., Smith, R. E., Macciò, A. V., & Moore, B. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 684
Seljak, U., Makarov, A., McDonald, P., & Trac, H. 2006, Physical Review Letters, 97, 191303
Shen, S., Madau, P., Conroy, C., Governato, F., & Mayer, L. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1308.4131
Simon, J. D., Bolatto, A. D., Leroy, A., & Blitz, L. 2003, ApJ, 596, 957
Simon, J. D., & Geha, M. 2007, ApJ, 670, 313
Spano, M., Marcelin, M., Amram, P., Carignan, C., Epinat, B., & Hernandez, O. 2008, MNRAS, 383, 297
Spergel, D. N., & Steinhardt, P. J. 2000, Physical Review Letters, 84, 3760
Springel, V. et al. 2008, MNRAS, 391, 1685
Strigari, L. E., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 2010, MNRAS, 408, 2364
Strigari, L. E., Koushiappas, S. M., Bullock, J. S., & Kaplinghat, M. 2007, Phys. Rev. D, 75, 083526
Strigari, L. E., Koushiappas, S. M., Bullock, J. S., Kaplinghat, M., Simon, J. D., Geha, M., & Willman, B. 2008, ApJ, 678, 614
Su, M., Slatyer, T. R., & Finkbeiner, D. P. 2010, ApJ, 724, 1044
Swaters, R. A., Madore, B. F., van den Bosch, F. C., & Balcells, M. 2003, ApJ, 583, 732
Tasitsiomi, A., Gaskins, J., & Olinto, A. V. 2004, Astroparticle Physics, 21, 637

Tempel, E., Hektor, A., & Raidal, M. 2012, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 9, 32
Teyssier, R., Pontzen, A., Dubois, Y., & Read, J. I. 2013, MNRAS, 429, 3068
The Fermi/LAT collaboration, & Abdo, A. A. 2010, ArXiv e-prints, 1001.3298
Thoul, A. A., & Weinberg, D. H. 1996, ApJ, 465, 608
Tollerud, E. J. et al. 2012, ApJ, 752, 45
Tollerud, E. J., Bullock, J. S., Strigari, L. E., & Willman, B. 2008, ApJ, 688, 277
Trachternach, C., de Blok, W. J. G., Walter, F., Brinks, E., & Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 2008, AJ, 136, 2720
Tremaine, S., & Gunn, J. E. 1979, Physical Review Letters, 42, 407
Trujillo-Gomez, S., Klypin, A., Colin, P., Ceverino, D., Arraki, K., & Primack, J. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, 1311.2910
van den Bosch, F. C., Abel, T., Croft, R. A. C., Hernquist, L., & White, S. D. M. 2002, ApJ, 576, 21
van den Bosch, F. C., Burkert, A., & Swaters, R. A. 2001, MNRAS, 326, 1205
van den Bosch, F. C., Robertson, B. E., Dalcanton, J. J., & de Blok, W. J. G. 2000, AJ, 119, 1579
Veilleux, S., Cecil, G., & Bland-Hawthorn, J. 2005, ARA&A, 43, 769
Viel, M., Becker, G. D., Bolton, J. S., & Haehnelt, M. G. 2013, Phys. Rev. D, 88, 043502
Viel, M., Becker, G. D., Bolton, J. S., Haehnelt, M. G., Rauch, M., & Sargent, W. L. W. 2008, Physical Review Letters, 100, 041304
Viel, M., Lesgourgues, J., Haehnelt, M. G., Matarrese, S., & Riotto, A. 2006, Physical Review Letters, 97, 071301
Vogelsberger, M., Zavala, J., & Loeb, A. 2012, MNRAS, 423, 3740
Vogelsberger, M., Zavala, J., Simpson, C., & Jenkins, A. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1405.5216
Walker, M. G., Combet, C., Hinton, J. A., Maurin, D., & Wilkinson, M. I. 2011, ApJ, 733, L46
Walker, M. G., & Peñarrubia, J. 2011, ApJ, 742, 20
Walsh, S. M., Willman, B., & Jerjen, H. 2009, AJ, 137, 450
Wang, M.-Y., Peter, A. H. G., Strigari, L. E., Zentner, A. R., Arant, B., Garrison-Kimmel, S., & Rocha, M. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, 1406.0527
Watkins, L. L. et al. 2009, MNRAS, 398, 1757
Wechsler, R. H., Bullock, J. S., Primack, J. R., Kravtsov, A. V., & Dekel, A. 2002, ApJ, 568, 52
Weldrake, D. T. F., de Blok, W. J. G., & Walter, F. 2003, MNRAS, 340, 12
Weniger, C. 2012, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 8, 7
White, S. D. M. 1984, ApJ, 286, 38
White, S. D. M., Frenk, C. S., & Davis, M. 1983, ApJ, 274, L1
Whiteson, D. 2012, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 11, 8
—. 2013, Phys. Rev. D, 88, 023530
Willman, B. et al. 2005, ApJ, 626, L85
Willman, B., Governato, F., Dalcanton, J. J., Reed, D., & Quinn, T. 2004, MNRAS, 353, 639
Wolf, J., & Bullock, J. S. 2012, ArXiv e-prints, 1203.4240
Yoshida, N., Springel, V., White, S. D. M., & Tormen, G. 2000, ApJ, 544, L87
Zavala, J., Vogelsberger, M., & Walker, M. G. 2013, MNRAS, 431, L20
Zhao, D. H., Jing, Y. P., Mo, H. J., & Börner, G. 2003, ApJ, 597, L9
Zheng, W. et al. 2012, Nature, 489, 406
Zolotov, A. et al. 2012, ApJ, 761, 71